

THE TWO CONFERENCES

HELD ON

February 7, and 13, 1734-5.

AT THE

BELL-TAVERN in *Nicholas-Lane*,

BETWEEN

Two *Romish* PRIESTS,

A

DIVINE of the Church of *England*,

AND

Dr. HUNT, and Mr. CHANDLER

Dissenting DIVINES,

TRULY STATED.

With some Additions and Supplemental Remarks
on a late printed Account of the said CON-
FERENCES.

By a GENTLEMAN who was present at both
CONFERENCES.

*Semper ego Auditor tantum? nunquamne reponam,
Vexatus toties?* JUVENAL.

L O N D O N:

Printed for J. WILFORD in St. Paul's Church-
Yard; and Sold by the Booksellers, and at the
Pamphlet Shops in *London* and *Westminster*.

MDCCXXXV.

(Price Six-Pence.)

The Reader is desired to correct with his Pen the following Errors of the Press.

Page 6. line 30. *read* concerning the Honour, Veneration, &c. of Saints and Angels might be discussed; which was readily agreed; p. 22. l. 25. *for* Prudence *read* Providence.

MDCCXXV



THE TWO CONFERENCES

HELD ON
February 7, and 13, 1734-5, &c.

DURING the Course of the Wars in Flanders, it was not always an easy Matter to know which Army was victorious. Both the *French* and *English* rejoiced at the Issue of the same Action; and *Te Deum* was sung at *Notre-dame* and *St. Paul's* in Thanksgiving for Success in the same Campaign. Something like this has lately happen'd, it seems, in this divided Metropolis. If we may believe the Publisher of these *Conferences*, or his Author, "The *Papists* have, with their usual Assurance, been vain enough to boast of a Triumph." *Pref.* I suppose he means vain enough to triumph, or boast of Conquest. And to let the World see that their worthy Adversaries are resolv'd not to be behind hand with them in that Particular,

he assures his Readers, that " a more complete Victory could not be gain'd, than was at these two Meetings, over the Adversaries of Truth." *Ibid.* Were I disposed to be merry I could ask a few Questions about the Meaning of this last Assertion; but I forbear; and assure my Readers, that I know not one *Papist* that has been so indiscreet as to boast of Victory; and in particular, that the Catholick Gentleman, who had much the greater Share in both the Conferences, never encouraged any of his Acquaintance to mention those Meetings, whatever Opinion he might entertain of his own Success in the Argument. When I laid out my Six-pence for the Pamphlet before me, I thought I had a Right to expect a true, full, and impartial Narrative of what pass'd in these two Conferences, and that I, as well as the Compiler, should be " satisfied it " was drawn up with all the Faithfulness and Candour that becomes an honest Man and a Christian." *Ibid.* I cannot think any impartial Person will find the Narrative, as it stands, will justify the Boast of a compleat Victory, or any thing like Victory on the Protestant Side; but if it is made evident to the Judgment of all present at the Conferences, that many material Things are omitted, several mistakes committed, and some very unfair Treatment used by our stout Champion for Truth, I hope the publick will allow that Honesty and fair Dealing are not confined to the Gentlemen of the reform'd Religion. But the Reader is to " see the " mean Artifices and little Shiftings of the *Papists* " from one Thing to another, when press'd in an " Argument." *Ibid.* Mean Artifices and little Shiftings are what I detest, at least as much as the Conference-monger, and am ready to condemn them wherever I find them. We shall see how well this Charge is supported against the *Papists*; or rather

ther that something very like this has been practised by Persons of a different Persuasion.

A *Romish* Priest had objected against some Passages in Mr. *Barker's* introductory Declamation, called a Sermon; "particularly, that wherein he charges the Papists with having sometimes called the Pope, *our Lord God the Pope*; and that wherein he asserted that the *Roman* Catholics paid the same Worship to Angels that was due to the supreme God." *Conf. p. 5.* Mr. *Barker*, with greater Propriety of Speech, had said, which is due to God alone." *Serm. p. 12.* The former Charge may be seen, *ibid. p. 20.* The Terms there used were new to the Priest; who therefore insisted on Vouchers to justify what he had asserted. This was neither strange nor unreasonable, since the Preacher had not produced or refer'd to any Authority in his Discourse at *Salter's Hall.*

The zealous Protestant, however, full of implicit Faith in the Veracity of his Pastor, engaged, under the Solemnity of a Wager, for the Appearance of the demanded Vouchers; and endeavour'd to secure Mr. *Barker's* Company at the ensuing Meeting; but he, not having Notice of it, was not there. *Conf. p. 5.* "The Priest, however came and brought another with him, besides some more Popish Friends." *p. 5. 6.* Here it may not be amiss to acquaint the Reader that the Person brought, and supposed a Priest, knew nothing of a Meeting till he was actually in the House; and when he was conducted up Stairs was very much surpris'd to find a numerous Company assembled. But on being assured by his Friend, that he had nothing to apprehend from them: That they were all Gentlemen of Worth and Honour; and that nothing said there would be mention'd out of the Room, he sat down, with a Resolution of hearing what pass'd, or talking in his Turn, as Occasion should offer. I very well

well remember he was seated between two Gentlemen; one of whom was by the Protestant Part of the Company called Dr. *Hunt*; the other Mr. *Johnson*, who by his Dress seem'd a dissenting Minister; but it seems *Romish* Priests are not the only Persons who appear here in Disguise; for the Gentleman last mention'd was, it seems, * a Divine of the Church of *England*. I must own I am very much edified at that Spirit of Christian Charity which prevail'd with the Church Divine to assist on such an Occasion, after two of the dissenting Preachers † had handled the Succession of Bishops and the Necessity of Episcopal Ordination, in a Manner which could not be very agreeable to one of his Communion. However, I shall, in the Course of these Pages, suppose the Fact; having too much Manners to question the Writer's Credit in this Particular.

But to return; after some Time spent in calling for Mr. *Barker's* Vouchers, which it was expected would be ready, according to the Protestant Gentleman's Promise; Dr. *Hunt* said he would not undertake to answer for another Man's Assertions; but would endeavour to give Satisfaction on that Head in another Meeting. The Gentleman, who came with the Person, who had called for the aforesaid Vouchers, declared it his Opinion, that the Dr.'s Answer ought to be received as satisfactory: To which he added, That if any Point was to be then disputed, Mr. *Barker's* other Charge concerning the Honour, Veneration, which of Saints and Angels might be discuss'd, &c. was readily agreed; and Dr. *Hunt* and the Priest, as he is call'd, talk'd about half an Hour on that Subject. After which the Catholick Gentleman, suppos'd by our Pamphleteer to be one of the same Character, was

* We are told in the News Papers, that it was Dr. *Crow*, Rector of *Bishopsgate*.

† Mr. *Chandler's* Sermon, p. 42, and Mr. *Neal's*, p. 34. allow'd

allow'd to discourse with the Dr. on the same Question.

The Doctor would have put him on shewing any one plain Text of Scripture, which recommends the Practice of Praying to Saints and Angels; but the Catholick Gentleman answering that it seem'd more reasonable to expect he should shew from Scripture that the said Practice was clearly condemn'd, as idolatrous or derogatory of the Honour due to God alone, the Doctor accepted the Proposal; and the whole Company appeared well satisfied with that Manner of Beginning.

* The Text first quoted, p. 6, *There is one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus.* 1 Tim. ii. 5. To this the Gentleman did indeed reply, as is here related, "There is but one Mediator of Redemption, but many of Intercession," and that "when we pray for others, we are their *Mediators of Intercession*; not *their Mediators* or *Intercessors*," as the Writer phrases it. A Distinction which is justifiable by the Expressions not only of some of the Primitive Fathers, but even by several learned Protestants. St. Gregory Nazianzen says, * *they mediate, or are Mediators with the Divinity.* This is spoken of the Martyrs in Particular. Asterius, a holy Bishop of Amasea in Pontus, who lived at the Close of the fourth Century, in his Oration, or Sermon on the Martyrs, makes no scruple of calling them *μεσσηται*, *Mediators*, in the same Sense: Other Authorities might be produced from Antiquity, to justify this Way of Speaking. But I promised to produce good Protestant Authority. The Profession of *Wittemberg* may appear first; in which we find these remarkable

* *μεσσηται τῆς Θεωσεως.* Orat. 6. Tom. i. p. 140.

Words. † If we are to speak of a Mediator of Prayer (or Intercession) every good Man is the Mediator of others through Jesus Christ. Because our Duty requires us to recommend one another's Salvation to God, by his Prayers. Bishop Montague says, * I should not deny that they (the Saints) are, as you commonly express it, Mediators of Prayer and Intercession. The same Author in his Treatise on the Invocation of Saints, p. 58. acknowledges the Practice of the Roman Church doth not impair or impeach the sure, firm, and fastest Mediation, the peculiar Work of Christ Jesus, or appoint Propitiators in his Place. And that it is false that they call upon Saints, as upon God to help them. *ibid.* The Reader is desired to pardon what may look like a Digression, but seems to me not improper for explaining what was meant by the Gentleman's Distinction.

Dr. Hunt said, "If he could shew him a command to pray to Angels, he would give up the Cause." p. 7. Was this a fair Demand, when as the Relator owns, p. 6. it had been agreed that the Doctor should begin and charge it on them (the Catholics) as an unlawful Practice? The Priest therefore, as he is here stiled, did not offer to do it." No, he was a fair Disputant, and resolved to continue on the Defensive, as he had begun by the Consent of the whole Company.

But we are told, *Conf.* p. 7, that "the Doctor proceeded to shew the Reason of those words of the Apostle, which was this: that it was the Custom of Heathens before the Time of the Gospel, to ad-

† *Si loquendum est de Mediatore Precationis, unusquisque pius factus est alterius Mediator, per Jesum Christum. Propterea, quod officium exigit, ut alter alterius salutem precibus suis Deo commendet. Tir. de Ordine.*

* Non abnuerim illos (Sanctos) esse orationis & intercessionis, ut loqui soletis, Mediatores. *Anti Diatrib.* p. 19. col. 2.

" drefs

“ dress themselves to *Jupiter* as the supreme God,
 “ by inferior Deities, or Angels, &c. this being
 “ the Practice of the Heathens at that Time, the
 “ Apostle directs the Christians how they should ad-
 “ dress themselves to the supreme Being, and that
 “ was but by one Mediator, exclusive of all others,
 “ that the Heathens did so highly respect; and
 “ therefore this was a plain Proof that Christians
 “ were to use no other Mediator than Christ alone
 “ for Intercession, as well as Redemption.”

I do remember that the Doctor gave this Exposition of the Text under Consideration, as it appears in the Pamphlet. But certainly it is a very odd one. In the foregoing Verses of the Chapter, *Timothy* is exhorted to take care *that Supplications, Prayers, and Intercessions, and giving Thanks be made for all Men, &c. as a Thing good and profitable in the Sight of God*: And then the Apostle assigns this Reason: *for there is one God, and one Mediator, &c.* Which Words seem only to express the unlimited Extent of our Saviour's Mediation, who died for, and intercedes for all Men; but by no means excludes what the Gentleman call'd a Mediation of Intercession by Saints and Angels, through *Jesus Christ*. As to the Parallel designed between the Practice of the Pagans and Catholicks in this Point, it is a Calumny grounded on a wilful Mistake of the Doctrine and Practice of both the Heathens and Catholicks. I should take up too much of my Reader's Time, if I should enlarge on this Question; and only prove at last what many of them already know and believe. I shall therefore refer such as are not fully satisfied in this Point to Dr. *Godden's* Book, entitled, *Catholicks no Idolaters*, printed in 1672. *Part. 3. Chap. 1.* I shall only add, that it will be more than difficult to shew that the Heathens in their Devotions, or religious Worship, invoked

the inferior Deities as Intercessors to *Jupiter*, as the supreme God. Each of their Gods and Goddesses, as they stiled them, being supposed to preside over particular Parts of the Creation, as *Nep- tune* over the Sea, &c. or over the Professors of particular Arts and Sciences, as *Mars* was called the God of War, &c. they were invoked absolutely; which every one knows, or may know is not the Practice of Catholicks.

But it seems the Gentleman was not satisfied with the Doctor's reply; and therefore asked this reasonable Question; "How doth it appear to be unlawful to pray to Angels?" (and Saints) *Conf. p. 7.* To which the Church of *England* Divine replied, "that it appeared so by many Texts, as *Col. ii. 18. Let no Man beguile you (of your Reward) with (in) a voluntary Humility, and worshipping of Angels, intruding into those Things, which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up in their (by his) fleshy Mind.* The Reader will observe how incorrectly this Text is quoted; and will perhaps thence be led to suspect neither of the two Reverend Disputants had a Hand in pening these Conferences. But we are told, which is true, that the Gentleman required the Divine to proceed to the following Verse; which he did, and repeated these Words, *Not holding the Head, viz. Christ.* Whereupon the Gentleman observed that Text could not affect the Veneration paid by Catholicks to Angels; because only such a Veneration for them is here condemn'd as is inconsistent with the Headship of *Christ*; and that the Practice of the Church of *Rome* was of that Sort, remained to be proved. But the Divine very judiciously replies: "You do by your Practice of praying to Angels virtually renounce or deny the Headship of *Christ.* — For he is willing to be a Mediator, he is sufficient

"cient to be a Mediator, and there is no need of
"Application to any other." *Conf. pag. 8.*

I believe every one will easily perceive this cannot be the Reply of a Divine; but the Author of the Pamphlet assures us it is; whereby he does him no great Honour. *Virtually renounce, &c.* I defy any Man to tell what can be meant by these words; and with what Honesty, or common Sense, Papists can be said *virtually* to renounce the Headship of *Christ*, when all their Prayers end with *through Jesus Christ our Lord, &c.* The Council of *Trent* has taken particular Care to explain the Sentiments of the Catholick Church on this Head, when it says: * *It is good and useful to invoke them, (the Saints; and the same holds good in Regard to Angels) and have recourse to their Prayers, Help and Assistance for obtaining Favours from God, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour.* I have already spoken of the Mediatorial Office of *Jesus Christ*. It remains only that I observe the Question is here quite altered. *There is no need of Application to another,* says the Divine. Neither the Catholick Gentleman, nor the Council of *Trent* ever said there was. *It is good and useful, &c.* says the Council; and only denies such Invocation to be Idolatry †. And we are ready to own there is but one *necessary* Mediator even of Intercession; but one, who can have immediate access to God for us.

As the Text last urged is usually brought as the most direct and formal against the Catholick Veneration of Angels, though, as I have shewn, with no tolerable Justice, I intreat my Reader's Pa-

* *Bonum atque utile esse suppliciter eos invocare: & ob beneficia impetranda a Deo per filium ejus, Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, qui solus noster Redemptor & salvator est, ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere.* Sess. xxv. Decret. de *Invocat, &c.*

† *Ibid.*

tience a few Moments, while I tell him what sort of Angel-Worship seems here condemn'd by the Apostle. First then, it seems from Verse 15. of this Chapter that *St. Paul* here speaks literally of the bad Angels, under the Appellations of *Principalities and Powers*, whom he had *spoil'd*; if so, the Text alledged is wide of the Purpose.

But secondly, it ought to be observed that in *St. Paul's* Time, the Platonists, as *St. Augustin* tells us, *De Civit. Dei. lib. 8. cap. 12, 17, 18*, sacrificed to several Gods, *Genii*, and *Demons*, and gave them other *Divine* Honours, whom they consider'd as *necessary* Mediators; which is far from our Practice. Lastly, *Dr. Hammond*, a good Protestant Commentator, makes no Application of this Text to the Practice of the Church of *Rome*; from which we may be allowed to presume neither his Learning nor Honesty would allow him to see the words of *St. Paul* in the least affected the present Question. He explains it of the *Gnosticks*. "It is known, says he, how great a Part of their Theology was made up of their Conceits concerning the Angels. — This Sort of Men are said to have continued long in *Pisidia*, and *Phrygia*; and therefore to have been forbidden by Canon in the Council of *Laodicea*, the chief City of *Phrygia*. — The Heresy of these *Angelitæ*, or *Angelici* was, under a Shew of Humility, that God was to be looked on with Reverence, as invisible and inaccessible, and to be sued to by the Intercession and Mediation of Angels; first by the lower, then the higher, till at last the Request was presented to God himself."

Well; but we are not to come off thus. The Divine has another Text ready. "When *John* fell down before the Angel to worship, the Angel said: *See thou do it not; for I am of thy Brethren the Prophets; worship God*. Here it was ask'd, "whether

“whether all religious Worship is forbid, by
 “this Place, being paid to Angels. This, conti-
 “nued the Gentleman, proves too much; for by
 “this you are not to bow to any Man, nor if you
 “have to do with the King to bend your Knee to
 “him; for according to your Exposition, this is
 “forbid.” *Conf. p. 8.* By the Way, no Exposi-
 tion of the Text is mention’d; so that the Reader
 is left to guess at the Matter. But “the Church
 “Divine answer’d; Sir, it is religious Worship that
 “is forbid, not civil Worship or Respect to fellow
 “Creatures.” *Ibid.* The Worship that the Apo-
 “stle was going to pay, was such as is due to GOD
 “only.” *Ibid.* Every Man sees at first Sight, that
 here is nothing like an Argument, and nothing
 more than two bold Assertions, *viz.* That religious
 Worship is forbid to be paid to Angels: And that
 St. *John* was going to pay a Worship to the Angel,
 which was due to GOD alone. We are not told
 what Answer the Catholick Gentleman gave to these
 Assertions; but I think he was not quite silent.
 However, since the Divine’s Words are published,
 he will not, I hope, take it amiss if I say a few
 Words to them. *Religious Worship*, he says, is *here*
forbid, not civil Worship, &c. I am glad to find by
 this Distinction that some Respect due to a Crea-
 ture may be called Worship. But, *religious* and
divine Worship are here confounded, and taken as
 Terms synonymous; whereas, though all divine
 Worship is indeed religious Worship; yet, when
 the Words are rightly understood, all religious
 Worship is not divine Worship. The Veneration
 paid to Saints and Angels being grounded not on
 any civil or temporal Consideration, but only on
 Principles of Religion, and on Account of the su-
 pernatural Excellency of Grace and Glory, with
 which they are invested by GOD, may innocently
 be called *religious Honour*. *To dispute whether we*
are

are bound to honour the Saints or not, says Mr. Thorndike, were to dispute whether we are to be Christians; and whether this be religious or civil, nothing but the Equivocation of Words makes disputable; and the Cause of that Equivocation, the Want of Words. Epil. par. 3. p. 353.

Now to the other Assertion. *The Worship that the Apostle was going to pay was such, as is only due to GOD.* If so, the Dispute is at an End; for no Catholick holds that divine Honour is to be paid to Angels. St. *Augustin* indeed was of Opinion, that the Angel appear'd in such a Manner that he might have been ador'd as GOD. Therefore the Adorer was to be corrected. Quest. 61. in *Gen.* Tho' Dr. *Hammond* seems not to suspect this; for thus he paraphrases, *Revel.* xix. 10. " And the Joy
" of this News so transported me, that, as *Abraham*
" for the Joy of the good News, *Gen.* xvii. 17. fell
" on his Face, &c. so I could not but fall down to
" acknowledge my Sense of so blessed a News and
" Messenger. But, when I did so, he bid me for-
" bear; for, saith he, I am no more honourably em-
" employ'd by Christ than thou art, I am now a
" Messenger to make known this Prophecy to thee
" of the Conversion of Emperors, &c. to the Gos-
" pel; and thou and such as thou, Apostles of
" Christ, are Embassadors of as honourable News
" as this. Let God have the Praise of all.

" No other Part of Scripture was cited, says
" my Author, only *thou shalt worship the Lord thy*
" *God, and him only shalt thou serve.*" Conf. p. 8.
To which he tells us no Objection was made. He means, no Answer to the Objection supposed to be implied in the Text against Veneration of Saints and Angels. But as the Catholick Gentleman, and all of his Communion detest the Thought of serving any Creature, as GOD, no Reply is necessary till that Charge is proved against them.

" They

“ They then slipt off into another Branch of Controversy, which was concerning the Authority of the Scriptures, or the Reasons Protestants had to receive them as the Word of God.” *Ibid.* If I mistake not, here are two different Branches of Controversy. But to proceed: “ Dr. *Hunt* said, his Reasons were of two Sorts, internal and external.” Here I must beg Leave to remind the Writer of a small Mistake. Dr. *Hunt* mention’d only internal Evidence. To which it was replied, that if internal Evidence, *i. e.* Purity of Morality, and Excellency of Precepts, was of itself sufficient to recommend a Book or Number of Books, as divinely inspired, the Writings of several antient Philosophers might be received as such. These, as well as I can recollect, were the very Words used by the Gentleman. Instead of which the Pamphleteer, by an egregious Blunder, is pleas’d to make him say: “ We have nothing to do with internal Revelation; the very Pagans have pretended to that.” Which is evidently a very different Question. After the Observation above mention’d, the Doctor’s Second added the Term *External Evidence*. We are told, *Conf. p. 9.* that the Catholick insisted on his Antagonist’s going on external Evidence; and that he perform’d it in the following Manner. “ The Scripture, said he, did foretel many Things to be fulfill’d in after-times, which we have an Account of the Accomplishment of in later times.” *Conf. p. 9.* So far relates only to the Prophetical Parts of the holy Scriptures; but even the Completion of Predictions is no certain Evidence that the Author of them was inspired or divinely assisted in all he wrote.

“ The Scriptures, continued the Dr. that contain these Things were dispersed abroad into many Hands, and deliver’d down from Age to Age as certain Verities.” *Ibid.* Here now was a fair Con-

Concession of the Necessity of Tradition; and the Catholick Disputant, did not fail observing that the Dr. admitted it in very plain Terms. *Ibid.* But this was too great an Advantage to be allow'd, without some Reserve or Distinction: "So I must, according to the Necessity of the Case, answer'd the Doctor; but not come barely to the Tradition of any Church. But these Scriptures were scatter'd up and down in many Countries, and so handed down to later Ages; which when we examine, and find them agree with what appears reasonable for us to suppose the Mind and Will of this good and holy Being, that we conceive God to be; that gives us sufficient Grounds to believe they are his Word." What a strange Medley is here! *First*, Tradition is to be admitted, *as the Case requires*. So far it is owned necessary. But then *not barely the Tradition of any Church*. What is the Meaning of this Exception? And what doth the Doctor understand, or think Catholicks understand by *Tradition* in this Case? Dr. *Cosins* shall tell him what that Word implies, and what Credit is due to Tradition. *For the particular and just Number of such Books (of Scripture) we have no better, nor no other external Rule or Guide, than the constant Voice of the Catholick, or universal Church, as it has been delivered to us on Record, from one Generation to another.* Scholastical History of the Canon of Scripture, Chap. i. Sect. 8. Edit. Lond. 1672. But the Doctor seems to repent of coming to Tradition at all; and therefore recurs at last to internal Evidence, or at least would insinuate that it ought to be the dernier Resort for judging what is, and what is not Scripture; for if what is call'd so *appear reasonable for us to suppose, &c.* I beg Pardon of the Doctor's Admirer, when I say this opens a Door to Deism; and leaves every one at full Liberty to receive or reject

reject any Part of, or the whole Scripture, as it appears to him reasonable, or not to be supposed the Mind and Will of God; notwithstanding the best and strongest Moral and external Evidence for its divine Authority. I do not charge the Doctor with all the Consequences of this loose Doctrine; but we too well know that our modern Wits have set up on the same Principle, and boldly pronounced several historical and other Parts of Holy Writ, trifling, false, absurd, and unworthy of God.

“Then they tell into Discourse, says my ingenious Author about the Plainness of Scripture, and the Manner of its being interpreted by private Persons.” *Ibid.* With all due Submission, the Question proposed by the Catholick Gentleman, was precisely this: Since it has, in some measure, been allow’d, that the Number and Quality of canonical Books is known by the Testimony of the Church; doth it not belong to the same illustrious and creditable Society to settle and deliver the true Sense of those sacred Oracles? Dr. Walton, a learned and judicious Divine of the Church of England says, * *The Word of God does not properly consist in bare Letters either written or printed, but in the true Sense of the Words; which no one can better explain than the true Church, to which Christ has committed this sacred Trust For which Reason all are, under a severe Penalty, obliged to hear her Voice; as she also ought in all Things to listen to her Spouse.*

The Catholick Gentleman back’d his Question with this Observation: That the Scriptures were written in Languages, at present unknown to much the greatest Part of Mankind; and though the Dr.

* *Verbum Dei non in literis, sive scriptis sive impressis, sed in vero verborum sensu proprie consistit; quem nemo melius explicare potest, quam ecclesia vera, cui sacrum hoc depositum commisit . . . Unde ejus vocem omnes, sub gravi poena, audire tenentur, ut & ipsa sponso suo in omnibus auscultare tenetur.* Proleg. v. Sect. 3.

and he might be capable of interpreting them literally, or should undertake to fix a Sense on some Texts, according to the best of their own private Judgments; as they would probably differ, and sometimes even contradict one another in such Explication, there ought to be some Judge for making the Scriptures a fix'd and uniform Rule. This, I am very positive, was the Substance of what the Catholick Gentleman said; and it is evident that it naturally follows what he had said concerning the Necessity of Tradition for fixing the Canon of Scripture. But he is made to speak in a Manner quite beside the Question: "He observ'd, says our *honest* Writer, that they (the Scriptures) were wrote at first in the learned Languages, and therefore seem'd to be design'd to be kept from the common People." *Ibid.* This is indeed a pretty *political Fetch*, to make a Man talk Nonsense and Impertinence, only that he may the more easily be answer'd. But, as I sincerely believe the Gentleman, who obliges the Public with this *honest, candid and faithful* Narrative, to be a *true consistent Protestant*, this can by no Means be term'd a *mean Popish Artifice*. So far was that Gentleman from ever designing to assert that the holy Scriptures were to be kept up from the common People, that, to my certain Knowledge, he wou'd be extreamly glad to see *good* Translations of them in all the vulgar Languages in Christendom; and would only have the Laity forbear interpreting them according to their own private Whims and Fancies; which would soon make them no certain Rule in Regard to any one Article of Faith. We are all sensible what a *blessed* Effect the unlimited Liberty of private Interpretations has produced among us. So that the Reason of the Thing holds good, though the Text alledged by the Catholick from *St. Peter*,

(2 Ep. i. 20.) viz. *No Scripture is of any private Interpretation*, be to the Purpose or not.

Dr. *Hunt* observed, that the Word (ἐπιλυσις) which is render'd Interpretation in that Text, refers to the Action of starting for a Race; so that "those Prophets who set out in their own private Spirit contrary to the Rule of God, went out in an unlawful Way," &c. *Conf. p. 10.* This the Doctor must have supplied since; for he neither mention'd the *Greek Word* at that Time, nor gave a full Account of its Meaning. In our *Lexicons* it is interpreted by *solutio, explicatio*, and that on the Authority of *Suidas*; as ἐπιλυσις is by *explicandi, & nodosas quæstiones solvendi peritus*, i. e. *one who has a good Talent for explaining and solving difficult Questions.* And one Manuscript reads διαλυσεως *Nov. Test. Oxon. 1675.*

The next Text produced on this Occasion was 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. *Our beloved Brother Paul, according to the Wisdom given unto him, hath written unto us all his Epistles; wherein there are some Things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest as they do other Scriptures to their own Destruction.* From which Words our Writer, either for want of Memory, or something worse, tells us the Catholic Gentleman infer'd "That it was dangerous for ignorant and unstable Persons to be entrusted with the Scriptures, because they would get Hurt rather than good thereby." It is certainly Charity not to trust any one with what will do them more Harm than Good. But, I repeat it, the question turn'd only on private Interpretation; and it is certain that the *Arians*, and other Hereticks pretended to support their erroneous Tenets by plain Texts of Scripture; and were condemn'd as such, because they took the Liberty of fixing their own Senses on the Words, contrary to that of the Catholick Church. The Doctor, however, as here

represented, instead of an Answer, favour'd the Company with the Meaning of the Words *unlearned* and *unstable*; which though far from exact, I shall pass by. But I cannot forbear taking Notice of a Criticism made by the Doctor, concerning the Words *in which* (not *wherein*, as it is here set down.) He observ'd that the *Greek* reads *ἐν οἷς* not *ἐν αἷς*, so that they could not refer to *Epistles*, which is of a different Gender; but was not so good as to tell us to what they did refer. I imagine he meant to the great Events mention'd in the preceding Verses. But is it not more probable that *ἐν αἷς*, *in which* (Epistles) as it stands in the *Alexandrin* Manuscript, is the true Reading, since Mention is made of *other* Scriptures in the same Text?

To return to our Narrative; "The Church Divine said, that People of all Sorts were exhorted "by Christ to search the Scriptures." p. 9, 11. If he did say this from St. *John* v. 39, to which Text I suppose he alluded, I will venture to say his Assertion was not strictly true, nor in the least to the Purpose. Not true; because our Saviour is there speaking to the *Jews* only, and concerning the Testimony which the Prophets gave concerning the Messiah; *and they are they which testify of me.* Not to the Purpose; because, as has been before observed, the Question in Dispute was not concerning the Liberty of reading or searching the Scriptures, but the Liberty of private Interpretation. To which it may be added, that the Word in the Original (*ἐρευνᾶτε*) may be either render'd *you do search*, or *search*; and consequently no conclusive Argument can be brought from the Text, till it is agreed, whether it is to be taken in the indicative or imperative Mood.

The Catholick Gentleman's Answer, that this Command (if it be one) could relate only to the Books of the Old Testament, no other Scripture being

being then extant, is certainly true. The Parity of Reason for *searching* all we are persuaded in the Word of God, is not denied; but *searching* and *explaining* are not synonymous Terms. It was observed, in the last Place, that "the *Bereans* are commended for searching the Scriptures, to see if the Things preached by the Apostle were so or not." They were justly commended for this Practice; but it should be observed, that this Enquiry was employed only on the Prophecies relating to the *Messiah*; which were so clear and express in Favour of our Saviour's Claim to that Character, that we are all ready to pronounce the *Jews* inexcusably obstinate in their rejecting him.

Thus ended the first Conference; and the Church Divine told the Company, it was his Opinion that all that could be said on both Sides, had been said. The Catholick Gentleman agreed with him. The Person first mention'd did then, in a very civil and genteel Manner desire some Discourse on *Transubstantiation*. To which it was as civilly replied the Time of Night would not allow it. The Company then desired that might be the Subject of another Conference, which was agreed.

Here follows a Copy of a long Letter, said to be sent by a Gentleman, who was present at both Conferences to one of the Priests some few Days after, which the Compiler of the Narrative thinks may not be improper to be inserted. That worthy Gentleman must excuse me, if I do not think it proper to take any Notice of it at present, for two Reasons. First, Because on Enquiry I am assured that no Letter has been received by either of the Priests, as they are stiled: Secondly, Because my Design being only to examine the Conferences themselves, the confused Heap of Mistakes, Calumny, and Impertinence, which appears in the said Letter, would carry me too far out of the Way.

The

The second was open'd with the Demand of Mr. *Barker's* Vouchers; to which Dr. *Hunt* answer'd, that the Preacher had told him that Morning, "he had Vouchers for what he said, and would produce them at a convenient Time, when called for." p. 16. This was by some look'd on as an Evasion; or at least the Result of an Apprehension, that the Assertion was not founded on Authority sufficient for charging the *Romish* Church with that Expression, as her common and general Language. For, as the Sentence stands in Mr. *Barker's* famous Harangue, any of his Hearers would naturally understand him, as speaking of the Papists in general. "As the Successor of St. *Peter*, says that accurate Gentleman, the Pope is accordingly called his Holiness, the Sovereign Pontiff, our most holy Lord the Pope, and sometimes our Lord God the Pope," &c. p. 20. But how is this black Accusation made good? Why a Gentleman "pulls out a Book, wrote by the Bishop of *Lincoln*, in 1678, in which the Words were asserted to be quoted from a Popish Book call'd *Clementine Canons*, or *Epistles*." *Ibid.* This was not allowed good Authority.

But, see how Prudence favours the *good old Cause*! "At this Time a certain Gentleman came into the Room, who was told what the Company was then upon." p. 17. I am not here to enquire who that certain Gentleman was, or what lucky Accident brought him thither at that critical Juncture, I shall keep my Suspicions to my self. He undertook, however, to justify the Charge by Extracts, he had brought with him, wherein "the same Titles are given to Pope John XXII, and Pope Gregory XIII. and that they were in Pieces dedicated to the Popes, and no where excepted against, that he knew of, by the *Roman Church*," &c. *Ibid.* This, and the rest of the Story, did not appear

pear satisfactory to the Catholicks then present; and I should think with good Reason too. They were complaisant enough not to dispute *the certain Gentleman's* Fidelity in making his curious Extracts; but declared their Dislike of such extravagant Flourishes of Court Rhetorick, wherever they might be found. They only insisted, that the extravagant Expressions of particular Men, of what Rank or Dignity soever, were not chargeable on the Church in Communion with the See of *Rome*. "They were no where excepted against, as he knew of, by the *Roman Church*." If by the *Roman Church* be meant the whole Body of Catholicks, he knows much the greater Part of them are unacquainted with those Flights. I assure him, for my own Part, I was an utter Stranger to them, till he was pleas'd to let me into the Secret. But if by the *Roman Church* not excepting against them, he means they have not been condemn'd in a general Council; it is true, but nothing to the Purpose: For they contain no Doctrine, nor have any Relation to Church Discipline, which are the only Subjects on which a Council proceeds. And it would be almost as reasonable to require a Convocation, or National Council should convene to condemn Dr. *Adam Littleton* for applying the Terms, *Diva Majestas, & Numen*, to King *Charles II.* in his Dedication to his Dictionary; and yet those Terms are no where excepted against by any Protestant Church that I know of. As to Pope *Nicholas's* fine Reasoning concerning his pretended Power in Temporals, it shall be allow'd as ridiculous and absurd as the Gentleman pleases; but will do him no Service.

This important Dispute took up, at least, as much Time as it deserved; and the Company called for the Question to be debated that Evening. But before I proceed I must let my Readers know that the Company had agreed, and seriously promised that

that the same Persons, and only the same, should be present at the second, as had appear'd at the first Conference. How well this Agreement was observed by the Protestants is well known; for the *honest Relator*, in a Note at the End of his Performance, lets us know *there were twenty Persons at the first Conference, and thirty at the second.* That *able Historian* may remember likewise, that the Catholick Disputant enquired for the Divine, who had invited him; thinking he had good Reason to expect so fair a Challenger would not fail coming: That he was told the Gentleman was very much indisposed; for which he took their Word very civilly, and then turn'd to Dr. *Hunt*, desiring him to supply his Place. The Appearance of Mr. *Candler*, who passes among some of the *Dissenters* for a very considerable Person, and some other Circumstances induce me to suspect they thought they had no despicable Antagonist to engage.

To prevent Confusion, Dr. *Smith*, a Physician, was chosen Chairman. I hope he has thank'd the Author of the Narrative for telling the World, "he perform'd the Office very well. p. 18.

The Catholick Gentleman open'd the Controversy with the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, and then read the Words of the Institution of the *Eucharist*; and called on Dr. *Hunt* to give his Reasons for taking them in a figurative Sense. After a short Pause, and a long Discourse, the Catholick Gentleman, being willing to proceed regularly and methodically, complain'd that the Doctor "had mention'd so many Things, that he knew not where to begin." p. 20. Here the Chairman began to exercise his Office, and "very sagely advis'd him to take it in Order; so they began about the Sacrament being a Memorial or Representation, and not the Thing itself." *Ibid.*

Dr.

Dr. *Hunt* had mention'd some Absurdities, which he said he conceived would necessarily follow from a literal Exposition: He had said "there is a plain Figure in respect to the Cup; *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*; that the Relief of a real Change, is contrary to Reason and the Testimony of our Senses, p. 20. I am confident the Company will do the Catholick Gentleman the Justice to own he answer'd these terrible Objections in a Manner much more regular and distinct than our Memorialist has represented; and that both they and he are injured by this imperfect and confused Relation. He is made to reply, "That it was a new Institution; and therefore it became our Lord to be very express, in the Declaration of the Terms in that Institution." *Ibid.* I am surpris'd he should pretend to say *what it became* God to do; I think he is not commonly so rash and unguarded in his Expressions. Besides, the Question does not turn on being *very express in the Declaration of the Terms*, &c. for both Parties, are agreed on the Terms, though they dispute the Sense and Meaning of them.

But, why is not the Publick inform'd, that the Catholick Gentleman quoted these Words of our Saviour in *Luke viii. 10.* *Unto you it is given to know the Mysteries of the Kingdom of God; but to others (I speak) in Parables.* From which Text he reason'd thus: *Jesus Christ* makes a manifest Distinction between his Manner of speaking to the Crouds of *Jews*, who follow'd him, either out of Curiosity or Malice, and that which he used to his Disciples. I suppose his Apostles were of that Number. To the former he frequently spoke in Parables: To the latter he explain'd those Parables. *St. Mark*, Chap. v. 34. expressly says, *when they were alone, he expounded all Things to his Disciples.* This Difference being clear; he asked whether it

was probable that our Lord, when *alone with his Apostles*, and on the Point of quitting them, would have spoken to them in a figurative or metaphorical Sense, without the least Hint of an Explanation? To this no direct Answer was given. Dr. *Hunt's* pretended Parallel is such as could not be expected from the Mouth of a Scholar and Teacher of the People. "The Passover, says he, which was the "Angel's passing over the Houses of the *Israelites* "when he slew the first-born among the *Egyptians*, "was the real Passover; but when the *Jews* in "after-times eat the Paschal Lamb in their own "Houses, and their Children did ask them, what "mean you by this Service? *Exod. xii, 29, 27.* They "were directed to say; *This is the Lord's Passover*; "though it only signified it to them." p. 21. That the *Angels passing over the Houses of the Israelites, was the real Passover*, is a notable Discovery, and truly worthy of a Doctor in Divinity. But when the *Jews in after-times did eat, &c. It was the Lord's Passover*, agreed. But has the Doctor or his *Amanuensis*, forgot that the eating of the Paschal Lamb was originally an Institution of a *bare Memorial* of the *Angels passing over, &c.* and, as such was as truly the Lord's Passover in after-times, as at the first Institution? If so, what is all this to the Purpose; since the Point in Dispute is whether the Eucharist be a *bare Memorial*, or Figure of Christ's Death or Body? This in a small Logician would be termed begging the Question.

The Priest, as he is called, must talk sillily; or there would be no Sport. Let us hear what he is made to say by his Protestant Prompter. "As to "your expressing Things figuratively, why do you "not expound in the Creed all the Passages figura- "tively, since you do that where it saith Christ is "ascended, and sits down at the right Hand of "God?" p. 20. A wise Question indeed! As to Christ's

Christ's *Ascension*, which is foisted in, I know not how or why, I am persuaded the Catholick Gentleman understands that Article literally, and presume the Doctor does so too. But why in general Terms, *as to your expressing Things figuratively?* The Truth is, the Doctor had been pleas'd to observe, *Ibid.* That *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*, was a plain Figure; from which he seem'd to infer that *this is my Body, this is my Blood*, were likewise figurative Expressions. To this it was replied, that the Metaphor or Figure was in the wrong Place; and that no conclusive Argument could be drawn from a Part to the whole. Thus, continued the Gentleman, *the right Hand of the Father*, in the Creed, is certainly a Metaphor or Figure; but doth it thence follow that every, or any one other Article of the Creed is therefore metaphorical?

The Doctor insisting on the Evidence of Sense, was told that our Senses could discern only the *Accidents* not *Substance* itself; and that no Change was effected in the *Eucharist* in any proper Object of Sense. The Catholick Gentleman added, that the Judgment, if it had follow'd, the Impression of Sense, would have been mistaken at the Appearance of the Holy Ghost, immediately after our Lord's Baptism. Now we read that *the Spirit of God descended like a Dove*, Matth. iii. 16. or, as St. Luke more strongly expresses it, *in a bodily Shape, like a Dove*, Chap. iii. 22. To this the Doctor is made to assert with his Antagonist, that their Senses, (in the common way of Speaking) were deceived, and then very gravely subjoin that they were not. For what else can be meant by observing, that "this might be the *Shechinah*, the Glory that used to appear in *Old Testament* Times; and he did assume to himself the Form of a Dove. But the Evangelist declares, that it was the Holy Ghost,

“ that assumed that Shape ; and so appearing in that
 “ glorious Form, their Senses were not deceived.”
p. 22. That is, in plain *English*, as they saw no-
 thing but the Form of a Dove ; their Judgment
 stood in need of some Correction or Information
 from Faith and Revelation ; and yet the Judgment
 form'd by the Impression of Sense was not erro-
 neous.

Then the Doctor observed, “ That it was called
 “ *Bread* three times by the Apostle (*St. Paul*) after
 “ Consecration.” True ; but what follows from
 thence, “ that it remained the same in Substance,
 “ *Bread and Wine*” after the Consecration. *p. 20.*
 A pleasant Consequence ! Are the Words referr'd
 to any Part of the Form of Consecration ? If not,
 they are not to the Doctor's Purpose. The Catho-
 lick Gentleman observed, that it was no uncom-
 mon Thing to call what is changed by the Name
 of what it was before the Change ; Thus, when our
 Saviour changed Water into Wine, it is called *Wa-*
ter after the Change ; and *Aaron's* Rod is said to
 have swallow'd up the Rods of the *Magicians*,
 which it could not do as a Rod, but only as a Ser-
 pent, into which it was changed ; so that, the *Eu-*
charist being called Bread after the Consecration
 “ is no more a Real Proof that it was not *transub-*
 “ *stantiated* by a Real Change, than that *Aaron's*
 “ Rod was not changed into a Serpent, because it
 “ was called a Rod afterwards.” Dr. *Hunt*, it
 seems, was so civil, as to attempt no Reply to this ;
 except his owning “ the Wine was called Water,
 “ because it was Water first,” *p. 22.* deserves that
 Appellation ; which was precisely what the Ca-
 tholick Gentleman had said. “ The Doctor usually
 “ made some Pause before he spoke, but at this
 “ time it being somewhat longer than ordinary, the
 “ Priest began to shew somewhat like a Triumph.”
p. 23. The Reader will be apt to think there was
 some

some Room for it; and perhaps may not change his Mind on an impartial View of the Remainder of this Conference.

But the Catholick Gentleman is not to come off thus. The formidable Mr. *Chandler* steps forth, relieves the good Doctor, and allows him time to smoke his Pipe, p. 23. "He rose up to speak; but the Priest interrupted him." Very rude indeed! "and appeal'd to the Chairman" tolerably civil! — "that he was to talk with one only at a Time, and not to two or three People together."

p. 23. There would have been no need of this Remonstrance had Mr. Chairman *performed his Office very well*. Though, by the by, this was not the first Time Mr. *Chandler* broke in on the Dispute. This second Champion begins with resuming what his Predecessor had said concerning the *Passover*; but as that has been already sufficiently answered, I shall not trouble my Readers what his Flourishes on that Subject, or the Catholick's reply.

The Person last mentioned is represented as saying, "This was a new Institution, which was instituted by *Christ* himself, who was the Son of GOD; and therefore he could do what ever he pleased."

p. 23. To which it was very smartly replied, "That GOD could not do some things — such as to lie, and deny himself, and to make Contradictions to be true." *Ibid.* Great News from the learned World! but a little unseasonable. Had Mr. *Chandler* condescended to prove, that *Transubstantiation* was one of those Things, which GOD cannot do, it might have been somewhat to the Purpose. Bishop *Forbes* says, * *It is a very dangerous and too bold Assertion of many Protestants, that GOD cannot substantially convert Bread into the Body*

* *Admodum periculose, & nimis audacter negant multi Protestantes Deum posse panem substantialiter in Corpus Domini convertere. Multa enim potest Deus omnipotens facere, supra captum*

Body of the Lord. For, continues he, *Almighty GOD can do several Things, above the Conception of all Men, and even of the Angels. There are certainly many Things which we all believe, which if human Reason be consulted, seem not less impossible, and to imply a no less manifest Contradiction than Transubstantiation itself.* If Mr. Chandler is one of those presumptuous Protestants, had not his Adversary some Reason to say, "This is a bold way of talking, to restrain Power of GOD?" p. 23.

The Catholick Gentleman observed, that St. Paul says, "He that eats and drinks unworthily is guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, &c. Consequently they must be really present in the Sacrament. p. 24. But Mr. Chandler had a Text ready: *Heb. x. 29. Who hath trodden under Foot the Son of GOD, and hath counted the Blood of the Covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy Thing.* "Now, said he, in like manner, that one is said to be guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ, that takes it unworthily, so the other is charged with trampling under Foot the Blood of the Son of GOD, though it was not his material Blood, that he could trample under Foot; but his despising that Blood in the Virtue and Efficacy thereof." p. 24. I do not remember what answer was made to this: or whether the Catholick Gentleman was permitted to make any; for all the Company must remember that Mr. Chandler, who is a Person of a ready Utterance, and is blessed with some other pretty Qualifications for an Orator, took the Liberty of pouring out so profusely, that he was desired not to preach, but sit down and argue coolly and regularly, as his Antagonist did. But, to make his Comparison compleat, He should

captum omnium hominum, immo & Angelorum. Certe haud pauca credimus omnes, quae si ratio humana consulatur, non minus impossibilia esse, quam ipsa Transubstantiatio. De Eucharistia, pag. 395.

have

have said, *as one is said to be guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ, who takes the Eucharist*, (for he did not care for the Word *Sacrament*, because not found in the Scripture) *unworthily, which is only a Sign or Figure of Christ's Body and Blood*; so, &c. which, however, would have been begging the Question.

“As to *discerning the Lord's Body*, if we believe him, that only Means that they received the Elements only in a common Way, &c. Why the *Elements*? Here is another Slip of the same Kind; and the Absence of our Lord's Body is supposed again; which was the very Thing in Dispute. But “the Corruption that was crept into the Church of *Corinth*, even in the Apostle's Time was, that they eat their own Supper, and one took and eat before another, and drank and was drunken.” p. 25. The Catholick observ'd that those Excesses were committed in the Meals which the first Christians took before the *Eucharist*, in Imitation of our Saviour's consecrating it after Supper, but did not say those Excesses, committed immediately before receiving the Sacrament of our Lord's Supper, were no Abuses, as our Author seems to insinuate, p. 25. But I must own it is not easy to guess what the Relator would be at; and yet he is full as clear and intelligible in this Place, as the Protestant Disputant. Mr. *Chandler* did indeed say that “the *Agapæ* or *Love-Feasts* used to be after the Sacrament, and not before, as could be proved by the Records or Testimony of the Fathers.” The Catholick Gentleman has consider'd of the Matter, and is still of Opinion, that, at the Time, when St. *Paul* wrote his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, these Repasts did preceed the *Eucharist*; and that the Chapter under Consideration is a full Proof of that Practice.

“In this Conversation the Priest would have it, that the Words, *this do in Remembrance of me*,
“refer'd

“ refer’d to the Action of the Priest, and the Power
 “ given to them to authorize their Consecration of
 “ the Elements in future times; and not to the Ac-
 “ tion of eating and drinking in the Remembrance
 “ of Christ.” But Mr. *Chandler* shew’d him the
 Words of Consecration, as reported by St. *Paul*,
 “ 1 Cor. xi. *Take eat, &c. This do, as oft as you*
 “ *drink it, in Remembrance of me.* Upon reading
 “ which Words the Priest gave it up.” p. 26. What
 did he give up? I believe he might say it was not
 very material to the Question whether *do this* re-
 fer’d to the Action of Consecration, or to that of
 receiving the *Eucharist*; but he never allow’d the
 Sacrament a bare, empty Remembrance or Memo-
 rial.

Mr. *Chandler* asked, “ What Body it was that
 “ *Christ* gave to his Disciples, when he instituted
 “ that Ordinance? Whether it was the same Body
 “ that was nailed to the Tree? and how can a
 “ Body be in more Places than one at a time? p. 26.

The Catholick Gentleman, we are told, “ sug-
 “ gested That there was a Distinction made by St.
 “ *Paul*, (1 Cor. xv. 44.) That there was a natural
 “ Body, and there was a spiritual Body; and the
 “ Properties of a spiritual Body he did not know.
 “ That might be in many Places at one time for
 “ what we know.” *Ibid.* The Gentleman did
 more than suggest, that the Apostle made such a
 Distinction. He directly answer’d, that it was the
 same Body as to the Truth and Substance of the
 Body, though *spiritual* as to its Endowments, and
 the Manner of its Presence, which is contrary to
 the usual Laws of Bodies. To justify this Distinc-
 tion, he quoted St. *Paul*, and asked Mr. *Chandler*,
 Whether our Bodies at the Resurrection would not
 be the same as now, as to the Matter, though dif-
 ferent as to their Endowments? *It is sown a natu-
 ral Body; it is raised a spiritual Body.* Instead of
 a direct

a direct Answer to this Question, the Protestant Champion, who understood his Business too well to give one, asked him, in a warm and overbearing Manner, "whether it was a natural or spiritual Body that was broken and crucified; because that was the Body, he is said to give to his Disciples." p. 26.

If the Catholick Gentleman, amazed at the Torrent of his Adversary's Eloquence, gave no other Answer to this Question than that "it was a real Body," *Ibid.* It was because he thought, and still thinks that sufficient, according to the Distinction, already laid down. But, *This was no Answer to his Question; Ibid.* We see, however, that he had a much better Talent at asking than answering; and the next Page convinces us, that he had some Sort of Emphatical and Polite Language at his Command, which gave him an unenvied Superiority over his poor Antagonist. "I demand, *says he,* whether it was a natural or spiritual Body. (as if the Catholick had talked of two different Bodies, and not the same Body being present in different Manners.) I will have an Answer to that, pursued our modest Disputant, for that is my Question. Therefore do not *riggle off* from it, (most elegant!) for *I will pin you down* to that; (beautiful and courtly!) and here I will keep you; you shall not *riggle off* from it; and if you do not answer me you shall give up the Cause." As the Beauty of these Expressions depended very much on the Manner of the Orator's Delivery of them, I cannot expect my Reader will be so well pleased with them, as some of his Audience seemed to be.

"Upon this, *says our Writer,* the Priest rose from his Chair, and said he would smoke his Pipe; and did not seem willing to engage any farther." p. 27. Is a Man obliged to continue a Dispute

E

with

with a Person, who delights in multiplying Words; who rambles on by the half Hour, without taking any Notice of his Antagonist's Arguments or Questions; who, in fine, will be answer'd, before he has made any Reply to what was asked him, and even after he had before had a plain Answer to all he pressed afterwards?

The Author of the Narrative is pleased to let the Publick know, that "the Priests could not agree among themselves what Body it was that was delivered in the Sacrament." p. 27. I am sorry those Gentlemen were so imprudent as to start a Scholastick Question about Terms (for such only it was) before the Company; but am assured they both meant the same thing. "The Priests, *continues* *he*, seemed to shew more Heat against each other about what Body it was, than had been shewn before against their Adversaries." *Ibid.* From this way of speaking one would imagine those Gentlemen shewed, at least, some Heat against their Adversaries. Had this worthy Author been an *honest* and *candid* Relator of Matter of Fact, he might have told the World that the Catholick Gentleman, whom he will have to be a Priest, preserved a Coolness and Moderation thro' the whole, which the whole Company was pleased to observe and applaud; for which he thanks them: that, in the first Conference, he quietly submitted to answer two Persons alternately; though he might very reasonably have objected against it; that, when Dr. *Hunt* made a longer Pause than usual, and desired Mr. *Chandler* to go on, declaring *he would smoke his Pipe*, p. 23. that Gentleman did not charge him with *riggling off*; but allowed him to quit the Field, without the least Reflexion; and that he never talked of *pinning him down*, &c. The Persons present at the conferences are desired to remember these particulars.

I cannot

I cannot recollect that "one of the Priests said, "before the whole Company, that he thought the "Council of *Trent* had expressed the Doctrine of "Transubstantion in too strong Terms; and wished they had left it more lax." p. 27. It could not be the Catholick Gentleman, who had much the greater Share in the Conferences; and that for two Reasons. First, because it is own'd, p. 18. that he read the Doctrine of that Council in its whole Extent; and undertook to maintain the Canon and Declaration, as the Faith of the *Roman Church*. Secondly, because no Objection was offer'd against the Strength of the Terms then employed. To this I may add, that I am well assured neither of the Priests, as they are termed, would presume to censure a Council; which they both hold to be a General one; and by whose Decisions they both profess to abide. So that, here must be some Mistake.

The Company, we are inform'd, desired, and "appointed another Meeting to be held at the "same Place, upon the 20th of the same Month." (*February*) p. 27. But with what View? not that of continuing the Conferences; or, at least, they did not declare that to be their Intention. No Subject or Question was named for a future Disputation. I do, indeed remember, that after the Disputes were ended, Mr. *Chandler* was pleased to say it could not be made appear from the first Writers of the Christian Church, that the *real Presence* was the Doctrine of the first Ages of Christianity. To which the Gentleman reply'd, he was confident it might; but that this Question could not be clear'd up without the *Greek Fathers*, with which he was but slenderly furnished. Mr. *Chandler* answer'd, that he was well provided with these Authors. Then the Catholick Gentleman
farther

farther observed, that such an Enquiry would take up more Time than could be allow'd in a Conference of that Sort, and required such Assistance as could not every where be had; but that, however, he was ready to enter on it at a proper Time. Mr. *Chandler's* last Words on this Occasion were, that "though the Article in Debate should be proved from the Fathers, he would after all recur to the plain Words of Scripture," *i. e.* to his own Interpretation of them. A Dispute of this kind would have been of no Use or Service toward the Discovery of Truth; and therefore the Catholick Gentleman allow'd it no farther Thought. But if this can, in any Sense, be term'd an Appointment, it was one *sine die*; and consequently has no relation to a Meeting the following Week. On the contrary, it was declared they should be very glad of spending an Evening in a free and sociable Manner with the Gentleman so often mention'd in these Papers; who, I well remember, gave nothing like a Promise of coming. "The Priests, however, gave some Expectation of coming." p. 28. What Reason the Company had to expect it, I have not been able to learn; nor do I know any Thing of the Excuse pretended to be sent for their Absence, in which they are made to alledge "it was dangerous for them to appear in such publick Company." *Ibid.* I am confident, at least, that the Gentleman, who was principally engaged in these Conferences, neither sent, nor order'd to be sent any such Message, or any Message at all.

It is possible, indeed, that the Gentleman's Friend, from his Manner of expressing himself at the Close of the second Conference, might send a Message of Excuse in his and his own Name; but that was not known to the said Gentleman, or even suspected,

suspected, till he read the Account under Consideration.

But let us suppose some Message, without enquiring from what Quarter it might come. "To this Message one of the Company replied, That it was a meer Excuse; because one of the Priests said before all the Company, that he could not entertain a Thought of his being in the least Danger from any of the Gentlemen present; and was perfectly easy in meeting Men of so much Honour, and who had treated him with so much Civility." p. 28. This was certainly an obliging Speech; and the Gentleman, whom I have so often mention'd, did indeed say something of that kind, at the opening of the second Conference. He had been engaged in the first, before he was aware of it; and his Caution of offending a mild Government, under which he lives secure and peaceable, would have made him decline any farther Discourse in so large a Company, at so critical a Juncture; had not it seem'd to him groundless from the civil Behaviour of all the Company. He ventur'd on a second Conference, in Compliance with an Invitation deliver'd by the Church Divine, in very polite and obliging Terms, and back'd by the unanimous Voice of all present. He came; and finding the Company much larger than before, thought fit to bespeak the Favour of the whole Assembly by telling them, he hoped, nay, would assure himself, that though the Clamour against Popery, at that Time ran very high, the present Meeting would not be understood as form'd with a Design of propagating Popery, or his Appearance there be construed into a Design of offending the Government. As he knew but three or four in the Room, it did not seem improper to deliver himself in this Manner; and he had the Pleasure of being told,

told, he had nothing to apprehend on that Head; and being desired to begin. How well his Candor has been repay'd; and whether the Publication of this imperfect and injurious Account of the two Conferences will justify him in his Opinion, or Presumption in Favour of those who were present at them, I freely leave the World to judge; declaring that I wrote this with no other Design than that of setting Matters in a true Light, and doing Justice to all engaged in the two Conferences: And I shall not think myself obliged to answer any Reply, in any other Manner than by an Appeal to the whole Company.

F. I. N. I. S.



ed;
th-
on
wo
re-
at
ing
of
ice
all
in
ole